Introducing changes in the tertiary language classroom: report on an action research project

Jeanne Rolin-Ianziti
School of Languages & Comparative Cultural Studies
University of Queensland

Paper presented to the Social Change in the 21st Century Conference

Centre for Social Change Research
Queensland University of Technology
28 October 2005

Introducing changes in the tertiary language classroom: report on an action research project

Jeanne Rolin-Ianziti
School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies
University of Queensland

Language programs in Australian universities are hiring more and more sessional staff employed on a casual basis to assume the teaching of foreign language courses. Sessional staff include postgraduate students and external staff hired on an hourly basis to teach a specific course. This increase in the number of sessional staff raises the question of their training. Even though some sessional staff are highly qualified and have previous classroom experience, most are at an early stage in their careers and need some help to carry out their language teaching duties efficiently. This paper will report on the initial, exploratory phase of a project aimed at developing a model for the training of sessional staff involved in the teaching of French courses at the University of Queensland. The report will show how contextual constraints such as time and the absence of a formal contract were overcome by introducing an in-service model of teacher training. The main features of the model include the focus on one area of teaching practice, error correction, which has been the object of extensive research in the field of Applied Linguistics, and the use of an action research approach to teacher professional development. The paper will conclude with a discussion on the future of the model. The use of action research combined with the application of findings from academic research may be regarded as innovative aspects of the model. However, further development of this professional in-service training model is very much dependent on the availability of funds to finance mentoring and sessional staff seminars.

Keywords: foreign language teaching; teacher education; action research

Introduction: background of the project

The need for teacher training is becoming crucial in Australian universities in view of the staffing situation. Due to a reduction in budget and increase in student numbers, teaching responsibilities, which used to be assumed by permanent staff, are now undertaken by sessional staff employed casually on a semester basis. Sessional staff mainly include postgraduate students pursuing higher degrees and external people hired on an hourly basis to teach a specific course. The increase in sessional staff has resulted in the need for teacher training. Even though some casual staff members are highly qualified and have extensive teaching experience, most are in the early stages of their career or are in need of additional training. External casual instructors usually have varied teaching experience, some of them requiring updating of their teaching methods. Postgraduate students particularly need support to develop teaching abilities as part of their professional training. The development of communicative skills for teaching purposes is a stated goal of postgraduate training in most Australian universities (see for example the Handbook of University Policies and Procedures, the University of Queensland, section 4.60.3, Statement of Postgraduate Research Student Attributes).

Many Australian universities have acknowledged the need to support sessional staff and some mechanisms have been put into place in response to the demand for training. For example, the Teaching and Educational Development Institute (TEDI), in charge of teaching quality assurance at the University of Queensland (where the present trial project was undertaken), has developed guidelines for the management of sessional staff (*Guidelines for Training, Managing and Supporting Sessional Teaching Staff*, 2003). These guidelines aim at helping Heads of Schools and course supervisors to recruit, train, evaluate and integrate sessional staff members into schools and have had a positive effect at a school level with programs being introduced to induct sessional staff. For example, the School of Languages and Comparative Cultural Studies at the University of Queensland now offers a four hour pre-service workshop to non-permanent staff at the beginning of each academic semester. The workshop informs sessional staff on matters such as equipment and facilities, procedures for claiming salary, staff members' responsibilities, and university instruments for evaluating courses. Such pre-service workshops are very valuable in providing new sessional staff with information on administrative matters.

However, there is no time, or too little time, during these pre-service workshops to address issues such as how to teach and become an effective communicator within the classroom context. Even though bodies, such as TEDI at the University of Queensland, recognize the need to provide casual staff with professional development in teaching, due to time constraints, no pre-service workshop is able to undertake any serious training at the micro level of classroom practice. In the specific area of second language teaching, which will be discussed in this paper, teachers need, for example, preparation to approach the teaching of new grammatical points or vocabulary items or to devise appropriate strategies to conduct comprehension activities or to correct learners' errors. Although sessional staff members may learn those strategies through teaching experience, training in such practices may be regarded as crucial to develop the ability to communicate with language learners and to become an efficient language teacher.

The search for in-service training suited to context

This lack of time in pre-service workshops prompted the coordinator (and author of the article) to trial in-service training with the team involved in the teaching of Introductory French in the School of Languages at the University of Queensland. The aim of the trial was to devise an in-service professional development model appropriate to the university context with the view of improving the sessional teachers' classroom communication skills. It was hoped that the time available in one academic semester would allow for the design, trial implementation and reflection upon a model that could be further improved and introduced on a more permanent basis in the future.

An investigation into educational models devised for the professional development of teachers was then undertaken in order to assess their appropriateness to the needs of our context. Since the seminal work of Dewey (1933) and Schön (1983), most models advocate the use of a reflective approach to teacher education. The emphasis is less on applying methodological principles devised by research and more on developing teaching expertise through a process of reflection on the action of teaching. Many frameworks aimed at helping novice teachers to teach in primary and secondary schools, use such a reflective approach (Colton & Sparkes-Langer, 1993; Calderhead & Shorrock, 1997; Pollard, 2002). The general assumption of such an approach is that teachers who reflect on their practices enhance their teaching abilities and become better practitioners.

Reflection on practice seemed congenial with in-service training. Some training could be introduced within our weekly teaching schedule and could involve an inquiry into the teaching of previous classes. The implementation of the approach in our context raised, however, two further questions. First, within the wide range of teaching dimensions, on which elements of the course would the inquiry be focused? Second, which method would help the teachers reflect on the elements selected for the inquiry?

In the specific area of second language teaching, many educators advocate the use of reflection to train language teachers (Crookes, 1993; Freeman & Johnson, 1998; Johnson, 2000; Mok, 1994; Richards & Lockhart, 1994; Wallace, 1991, 1998). As for the focus of reflection, two main aspects of language teaching have emerged from programs aimed at developing professional expertise. Firstly, the focus may be on the teachers' prior learning and teaching experience, and on their beliefs about the learning and teaching processes (Freeman and Johnson, 1998). Such an approach to teacher development is based on the assumption that personal experience and values shape teachers' behaviour. Secondly, the focus of inquiry may rest on the classroom practices that teachers use to achieve the specific goal of teaching a second language. For example the last chapter in Richards and Lockhart's book (1994, pp. 161-181), focuses on the specificity of teaching practices or, in the authors' words, '*the nature of language learning activities'*. Such activities include, for example, presenting new linguistic materials, organizing controlled activities for practicing previously introduced items, conducting comprehension activities to develop learner understanding of oral and written texts, managing application activities to encourage students to use the language in a more creative way, and developing feedback strategies to correct student oral and written work. Other educators advocate a focus on one of the above activities or on

another single aspect of language teaching which may be considered vital to meet instructional objectives, such as the teaching of grammar (see Zéphir, 2000).

Covering all aspects of language teaching listed in the literature on teacher training was not feasible within the timeframe of one semester, and hence targeting only one practice seemed a way to overcome the time constraints of in-service training in our context. We will explain below (see section on *Initial identification of a teaching need)* how we came to the decision to focus training on the practice of correcting errors after a student task.

Educational research also provides a method to implement a reflective approach to teacher training. Since the 1970s, educators have developed action research as a tool to help teachers reflect on their teaching practices (Stenhouse, 1975, quoted in Pollard, 2002, p. 6). More recently, researchers such as Nunan (1990) and Wallace (1997) have adapted the approach to meet the specific needs of professionals involved in the teaching of a foreign language.

In Wallace's words, the main procedure of the action research method consists of collecting data '*in one's everyday teaching'* and of analyzing the data '*in order to come to some decisions about what your future practice should be'* (Wallace, 1998, p. 4). Accordingly, as we were conducting our regular classes, we could collect data on one specific strategy and then analyze it with a view to introducing improvements in performing the selected strategy. More specifically, the action research method involves going through a *reflective circle* (Wallace, 1998, p. 12), which, depending on context, generally includes a number of phases: identifying an initial need in one' s own teaching context; collecting data to analyze the issue; and devising and implementing an action plan to introduce changes (Wallace, 1998, p. 14). As action research views the introduction of changes as a continuous process, the reflective circle also comprises two other phases: assessing the effects of the implementation of the action plan and making further modifications (Kosnik & Beck, 2000, p. 120).

This paper reports on how we implemented the first three phases of an action research project (identifying a teaching need, analyzing data and devising an action plan) as they occurred during the timeframe of one semester. The purpose of the project was to offer some training to the sessional staff involved in the teaching of a specific introductory French course. It was also to trial an in-service professional model in order to investigate whether it was suitable to meet the needs of sessional staff involved in tertiary level language teaching in Australia. The model is in the early stage of its development and the present paper very much constitutes a report on a work in progress. After detailing the implementation of the action research project, the paper will consider the preliminary outcomes and reflect upon the strengths and limitations of the model. The paper will conclude with a brief discussion of the possibility of further developing this in-service professional training model in light of the current funding climate within Australian universities.

The context of the Action Research trial

The project was trialled in the first semester of a first year French course geared for students who start French at the University of Queensland. The course aims at

developing oral communication skills. Students have four scheduled contact hours per week during a 13-week semester.

The course coordinator (T1), full staff member and author of this article, and four casual staff (T2, T3, T4 and T5) taught the introductory French course in which approximately 160 students, divided into 6 groups, were enrolled. Among the five participants, T1 played the role of mentor and facilitator of the action research project. She initiated the process by identifying a teaching practice in need of improvement and she facilitated the completion of the project by providing the materials needed to carry out some reflection tasks. T1 has developed a research interest in language pedagogy through her involvement in the teaching of the French language in various American and Australian universities.

As for the four part-time teachers, they had varied formal educational backgrounds. None had qualifications in language teaching. One (T2) had graduated in linguistics from a French university, another (T5) had qualifications in communication studies, and two (T3 and T4) had completed a Bachelor of Arts in French with Honours. As for teaching experience, two teachers (T2 and T5) had taught French extensively, one (T2) at primary, secondary and tertiary levels and the other (T5) by participating in the delivery of the local Alliance Française courses. In contrast, two others (T3 and T4) had no or very little experience with the classroom. One teacher (T4) was enrolled in the postgraduate program to obtain a doctorate in French literature. All four teachers had a very high level of proficiency in French. Two were native speakers of French (T2 and T5) while the two others (T3 and T4) had a near native command of the language.

Identification of a teaching need and selection of error correction as the project focus

The focus of the in-service project was devised in close relation to one of the assessment requirements of the course: oral conversation tasks. In groups of three, students prepared a conversation based on a topic worded in such as way as to encourage them to reuse the linguistic content introduced in class as part of the course objectives. After preparing outside of class, each group acted out the conversation in front of the teacher to obtain a mark. After the presentation, the teacher corrected students' errors. The students performed the same task on different topics three times during the semester in weeks 4, 8 and 13.

Before the implementation of the project, T1 had co-marked oral assessment sessions with other teachers involved in the same introductory course. Her participation in the sessions gave her the opportunity to observe the teachers' oral correction strategies. Her observations indicated that the teachers' corrective practices were not in line with the recommendations of research carried out in the field of Applied Linguistics (Long, 1996 ; Lyster & Ranta, 1997). For example, the teachers relied too much on explaining grammar or pronunciation rules and did not encourage students to self-correct. T1 identified the need to improve corrective strategies qualitatively (to foster learner participation) but also quantitatively (to extend the teachers' range of corrective techniques).

The teaching practice of correcting learners' errors is commonly referred to in the literature as *feedback.* In our context, teacher correction was occurring after the completion of a student task and this specific type of correction technique is further designated as *delayed feedback.* Qualitative classroom-based studies have provided fine-grained descriptions and classifications of feedback techniques (Chaudron, 1988). Furthermore, scholars in Second Language Acquisition have theorized and empirically shown that correction strategies other than explanation may have a more beneficial effect on language acquisition. For instance, researchers working within an "interactionist" framework advocate introducing in the classroom strategies used in conversations between Native-Non-Native speakers in a "natural" environment (Bange, 1992; Long, 1996). In such conversations, the speakers' focus is not so much on the forms of the language but on meaning in order to achieve mutual understanding. Communicative strategies include, for example, implicit reformulations or recasting of erroneous utterances (Long, Inagaki & Ortega, 1998) or asking for clarification (Bange, 1992). Based on classroom data, other scholars argue that '*the negotiation of form*' between teacher and leaner promotes learner self-correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). In our context, the teachers' practices were not in tune with the above theoretical and empirical research on feedback, which posits a focus on meaning and the learners' active participation in the corrective process as beneficial to acquisition. Furthermore, the extensive use of one corrective technique (rule giving) indicated that the teachers might not be aware of all strategies at their disposal to correct errors.

Training teachers in the sole area of error correction was feasible within the timeframe of one semester. An in-service action research project could be devised with the specific aim of improving corrective practices. The assessment requirements of the course allowed meeting this identified need. As the teachers corrected the same task three times over the semester, they had the opportunity to collect data during the first task, to reflect critically on the data and to introduce changes in error correction during subsequent feedback sessions. A more detailed account of the various phases of the project is provided below.

Implementing the action research project during the semester

Planning the process

During the usual weekly one-hour teacher meeting in week 3 of the semester, the students' upcoming first oral assessment was discussed. T1 informed the team that students would be given a summative evaluation (a mark) but that they also needed feedback (a formative evaluation) in order to become aware of their errors and improve their performance at the next conversation. The issue of how to correct errors was raised but no strategy was discussed at this point, the teachers agreeing to investigate their own practices first. Under T1's encouragement, the teachers made the decision to examine the feedback strategies they had already acquired through previous teaching experience or were able to introduce on their own.

Initial data collection phase - conversation 1

In week 4 of the semester, all teachers but T4 (who had technical problems) audio-recorded the teacher feedback sessions occurring after each group of students had performed conversation 1.

Reflecting individually on the data

At another meeting in week 6, T1 proposed a task to the team of teachers to help them reflect on their corrective strategies. The task asked the teachers to listen to their own recording of the feedback session based on conversation 1 and to reflect critically on their corrective practices with the help of questions.

T1 had devised a list of questions based on a task taken from Penny Ur's book *A Course in Language Teaching* (1996, p. 249) and on additional research on feedback (Long, Inagaki & Ortega, 1998). Penny Ur's task was selected because it specifically aims at observing *oral correction techniques* and lists some feedback strategies derived from research. Techniques coming from other sources such as asking for clarification and reformulations (Chaudron, 1988; Bange, 1992; Long, Inagaki & Ortega, 1998) were added. The list of questions also included two other areas of inquiry: the provision of positive feedback (informing students about positive aspects of their performance) and the types of errors targeted for correction. In sum, the list raised three main questions: 1) did we give positive feedback? 2) which errors did we correct? and 3) how did we correct them? (See individual task in appendix).

Devising an action plan to correct conversations 2 and 3

At another meeting in week 8, all teachers met to decide which categories of those listed in the individual task (see appendix) should be given priority for correcting conversations 2 and 3. Three main decisions were reached collectively:

1) Provide positive feedback after each group performance. Teachers decided to start each feedback session by indicating what was right in the student conversation before correcting what was wrong with the view of encouraging and motivating students;
2) Prioritize the correction of errors involving items that are part of the course objectives and that have been previously covered in class;
3) Introduce systematically feedback techniques eliciting the students' own reformulation of erroneous utterances. Among the feedback strategies listed in section 4 of the task (see appendix) the teachers decided to give preference to those that would encourage student self-correction or participation in the correction process. As discussed above, such strategies include, for example, asking for clarification.

The teachers agreed to implement this three-part action plan for the upcoming correction of conversations 2 and 3. After the meeting, T1 distributed a written record of the above action plan to all teachers. The record listed the decisions taken during the meeting. It

was also accompanied with a request: each teacher was asked to listen to her own audio-recorded data of conversation 1 and, when possible, to add examples of feedback techniques under each category listed in the action plan. T1, the mentor, had decided to proceed in this manner so as to illustrate the action plan whose categories where at this stage somewhat abstract. It was hoped that the addition of examples coming from the teachers' own practices would facilitate the implementation of the decisions in the action plan. For example, T1 provided the following excerpt of her own practice to exemplify decision three, elicitation of the student's self-correction:

Example 1:
T1: Quelle est votre profession?
Su: Je suis **médiquin.** (wrong prononciation: /mɛd**k**$\tilde{\varepsilon}$ / instead of /mɛd**s**$\tilde{\varepsilon}$/)
T1: Ah médecin ou mannequin?
Su: **Ma- médiquin.** (mispronunciation repeated)
T1: Euh *doctor*
Su: x
T1: Ah d'accord. *I thought you were a model* mannequin non vous êtes
Su: **Médiquin** (mispronunciation repeated)
T1: Mé-médecin médecin
Su: **Médecin.** (correct prononciation)
T1: Médecin.
(assessed conversation 1, T1)[i]

Translation of example 1:
T1: What is your profession?
Su: I am a **doctor** (wrong pronunciation)
T1: Ah, a doctor or a model ?
Su: **Do-doctor** (mispronunciation repeated)
T1: Um, *doctor* (codeswitch to English)
Su: x
T1: Oh okay. *I thought you were a model* model no you are a
Su: **Doctor** (mispronunciation repeated)
T1: Do-doctor doctor
Su: **Doctor.** (correct prononciation)
T1: Doctor.

The completed written record, a compilation of all the examples provided by the participating teachers, was subsequently circulated to the team. This written record was distributed in week 11, just in time for implementation during week 12 when students were due to act out conversation 3.

Assessing the initial action research model

Preliminary anecdotal evidence

At this stage of the present project we only have anecdotal evidence on the outcomes of the trial gathered through informal discussions with two teachers. T3, a novice teacher, reported that the experience had been '*useful'* for her as it had allowed her to develop

new correction techniques. In contrast T2, an experienced teacher, who was highly engaged in the project, alluded to '*difficulties'* in implementing the strategies listed in the written record of the action plan despite a careful consideration of the record content. These comments indicate that the project may have been more beneficial to the novice teacher. T2's comments also suggest that some teachers may have problems at the implementation phase of an action research project. In a future phase of this project, it would be necessary to investigate how teachers go about converting reflection and decision making into action. These few comments are, however, insufficient to draw conclusions as to the impact of the project on the teachers' strategic use of error correction.

The strengths of the model

The most positive aspect of the model trialed so far rests on its attempt at introducing academic research into teaching practices. Some phases of the action research project are informed by academic research carried out in the field of Applied Linguistics. The initial identification of a need to improve error correction is based on readings in the areas of classroom research (Chaudron, 1988) and Second Language Acquisition (Bange, 1992; Long, 1996). Similarly, the list of questions (see appendix) designed to help the teachers' reflective process borrows from research on feedback strategies (Long, 1992) and from educational research (Ur, 1996). Finally, the action plan, which gives priority to student self-correction, draws its inspiration from studies in Second Language Acquisition on the role of error correction (Lyster & Ranta, 1997). Thus the specificity of the action research model proposed in this paper comes from its drawing from academic research in order to introduce changes in language teaching. By so doing, it bridges the gap between theoretical and empirical research and classroom practice. In language teaching, this aim is viewed as desirable by some educators who see it as a way to bring innovations as well as improvements in classroom practices (Zéphir, 2000; Macaro, 2001).

Its potential to incorporate academic research into teaching, makes the action research model discussed in this paper worth developing further in the future. The model can be adapted to train sessional staff in other crucial areas of language teaching. Approaches to the teaching of grammar come to mind as a focus for a future trial as there is a significant body of empirically-based findings which could form the basis of teacher training (see for example Doughty & Williams, 1998; Ellis, 1998).

Limitations and future modification of the model

Limitations or problematic aspects of the project must also be highlighted. Notably, while the preliminary anecdotal evidence from T2 and T3 provides some insights about the implementation of the action plan, during future phases of development of this professional in-service model it will be important to more rigorously assess the outcomes. A more critical appraisal of the model could, for instance, be achieved via a thorough self-report interview protocol designed to elicit teachers' perceptions about the impact of the training. The effects on teachers' corrective behavior could also be

measured more objectively through the description and comparison of their practices prior to and following the implementation of the project.

A further limitation of the model is its narrow focus, which is obvious at two levels: (1) it deals with professional development in practice only and (2) it trains in one specific practice exclusively. These two limitations are further detailed below.

Firstly, the model develops practical teaching skills at the expenses of other kinds of knowledge needed to carry out the complex task of teaching a foreign language. In particular, there is no provision for developing knowledge of the subject matter, the French language. Such knowledge includes not only proficiency in the target language, but also an understanding of the features of the target language. Some educators in language teaching argue convincingly that reflection on practice is insufficient to improve practice without the complementary development of language knowledge (Yates & Muchisky, 2003). In fact, studies have shown that the skill of error correction requires not only the use of specific strategies but also the ability to detect and analyze learner errors (Birdsong and Kassen, 1988, quoted in Murray, 2002). According to Murray, such ability very much depends on '*explicit training'* in the *'appropriate concepts for the analysis of the language'* (2002, p. 195).

The model that we propose does not offer training in language whereas knowledge of key linguistic notions is crucial for teachers to develop the ability to carry out in the classroom such important teaching activities as error correction. The time constraints imposed on in-service training does not allow to cater for the development of language knowledge, nor for training teachers to put the knowledge into practice. So as to develop the practice of error correction in a French course, such training would involve, for example, extra seminars dealing with the specific features of the linguistic system of the French language. It would also require training teachers into applying that linguistic knowledge to the skill of detecting and analyzing learners' errors in order to give appropriate feedback. These training requirements are obviously too demanding in terms of time to be met during the teaching semester. Pre-service workshops or seminars run in conjunction with the in-service activity trialed so far, would have to be organized in order to meet those extra training needs.

Secondly, the model focuses exclusively on practice. It also solely develops teaching skill in error correction, disregarding or postponing training in other practice areas until another teaching semester. Apart from teaching activities listed above (see p. 6) such as presenting new linguistic items or organizing practice activities, other areas must be the focus of critical reflection if full professional expertise is to be achieved. For example, such vital dimensions of language teaching as learner assessment, teacher speech modifications and lesson plan design should also be dealt with as they are in most educational programs for language teachers (Richards & Lockhart, 1994).

Conclusion: future of the model within the Australian context

The narrow focus of our project was a way to bypass the time constraints placed on teacher training by the university context. In fact, the future of the model very much depends on working even more closely within the current tertiary situation and in tune with the changes in funding presently occuring in Australian universities.

Minimal conditions for the implementation of the model in the future include: first, the availability of a full-time member of staff; and second, funding for paying sessional staff to attend pre-service workshops and weekly meetings during the teaching semester. A full-time staff member is needed to keep up with research in Applied Linguistics and to play the role of mentor. As indicated above in the discussion of the limitations of the model, additional workshops may also be needed to extend sessional staff's knowledge of the second language. The present managerial climate, however, seems to be moving towards a separation of teaching and research staff. Casual staff members are increasingly involved either exclusively in research or solely in teaching, whereas a decreasing number of permanent staff members carry out both duties. As for the specific case of staffing in language programs, sessional staff members (who are not all involved in research in Applied Linguistics) increasingly cover teaching duties. In this context, an action research model aiming at bridging the gap between academic research and teaching practice becomes problematic. Furthermore, the time made available for sessional teachers' meetings to discuss teaching matters tends to be reduced, jeopardizing the aim of developing an action plan. For example, when we started the project in 2003, sessional teachers were required to attend weekly meetings; they are now asked to meet only three times during the semester. The positive aspects of the model highlighted above become more and more difficult to implement within the present move towards rationalization in Australian universities.

There are, however, encouraging changes within the current context, which may help bypass current constraints. The Australian government has recognized the need to introduce changes in tertiary level teaching. For example, the recent opening of The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education has the mission of promoting projects enhancing teaching at university level. This kind of development shows that, in the future, funding may become available to financially sustain the training of sessional staff. Before further developing the present action research model, however, we should be aware that changes at the micro level of the language classroom are very much dependent on staffing resources and financial opportunities made available at the macro level of the Australian educational system.

References

Bange, P. (1992). A propos de la communication et de l'apprentissage en L2, notamment dans ses formes institutionnelles, *AILE,* 1, 53-85.

Birdsong, D. & Kassen, M. (1988). Teachers' and Students' Evaluations of Foreign Language Errors: A Meeting of Minds? *Modern Language Journal,* 72 (1), 1-11.

Calderhead, J. & Shorrock, S. (1997). *Understanding Teacher Education, Case Studies in the Professional Development of Beginning Teachers,* London: The Falmer Press.

Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second Language Classrooms: Research on Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Colton, A. B., & Sparks-Langer, G. M. (1993). A Conceptual Framework to Guide the

Development of Teacher Reflection and Decision Making. *Journal of Education* 44, 45-54.

Crookes, G. (1993). Action Research for Second Language Teachers, Going beyond Teacher Research, *Applied Linguistics,* 14, 130-144.

Dewey, J. (1933). *How We Think: A Restatement of the Relation of Reflective Thinking to the Educative Process.* Chicago: Henry Regnery.

Doughty, C. & Williams, J. (Eds.) (1998). *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ellis, R. (1998). Teaching and research: Options in grammar teaching. *TESOL Quarterly,* 32, 39-60.

Freeman, D. & Johnson, K. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32,* 397-417.

Guidelines for Training, Managing and Supporting Sessional Teaching Staff (2003) Teaching and Educational Development Institute, the University of Queensland [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 21, 2005, from http://www.tedi.uq.edu.au/SessionalTeaching/guidelines/ST_Guidelines.pdf

Handbook of University Policies and Procedures, University of Queensland (2004) [Electronic version]. Retrieved October 21, 2005, from http://www.uq.edu.au/hupp/

Johnson, K.E. (2000). Innovations in TESOL teacher education: A quiet revolution. In K.E. Johnson (Ed.), *Teacher Education.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL, 1-7

Kosnik, C. & Beck, C. (2000). The Action Research Process as a Means of Helping Student Teachers Understand and Fulfil the Complex Role of the Teacher, *Educational Action Research,* 8 (1), 115-136.

Long, M. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W.C. Ritchie & T.K. Bhatia (Eds.) *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Long, M., Inagaki, S. & Ortega, L. (1998). The role of implicit negative feedback in SLA: Models and recasts in Japanese and Spanish. *The Modern Language Journal,* 82, 357-371.

Lyster, R & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 19, 37-61.

Macaro, E. (2001). Analysing Student Teachers' Codeswitching in Foreign Language Classrooms: Theories and Decision Making. *Modern Language Journal* 85 (4), 531-548.

Mok, W.E. (1994). Reflecting on reflections: experienced and inexperienced ESL teachers, *System,* 22 (1), 93-111.

Murray, H. (2002). Developing language awareness and error detection. What can we

expect of novice trainees? In Hugh Trappes-Lomax and Gibson Ferguson (eds.) *Language in Language Teacher Education,* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Nunan, D. (1990). Action research in the language classroom. In Richards, J. & Nunan, D. (eds) *Second Language Education,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pollard, A. (2002). *Reflective Teaching, Effective and Evidence-informed Professional Practice*, London, New York: Continuun.

Richards, J. (1998). *Beyond Training,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. & Lockhart, C. (1994). *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schön, D. (1983). *The Reflective Practictioner*. New York: Basic Books.

Stenhouse, L. (1975). *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development,* London: Heinemann.

The Carrick Institute for Learning and Teaching in Higher Education, Mission Statement, Australian Universities Teaching Committee, Australian Government, Department of Education, Science and Training, http://www.autc.gov.au/institute/mission.htm Last accessed October 21, 2005.

Ur, P. (1996). *A Course in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, M. (1991). *Training Foreign Language Teachers: A Reflective Approach.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wallace, M. (1998). *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yates, R. & Muchisky, D. (2003). On Reconceptualizing Teacher Education, *TESOL Quarterly,* 37 (1), 135-147.

Zéphir, F. (2000). Focus on Form and Meaning: Perspectives of Developing Teachers and Action-Based Research. *Foreign Language Annals* 33, 19-30.

Appendix

Task designed for individual reflection on correction of conversation 1

Listen to the cassette of the feedback sessions for conversation 1 and reflect on your practices by using the following questions:

1. When did we correct students? Check that we corrected after the performance of the conversation, not during.

2. Did we give positive feedback? How often?

(Feedback = any information to learners on their performance with the aim of improving performance. Positive feedback = information on what students did right; negative feedback = information on what they did wrong). Transcribe one example.

Did we use polite or supportive expressions before giving negative feedback? Transcribe one example.

3. Which errors did we correct? Which errors did we ignore?
Make a list for 3 groups. Is there any consistency or are there any reasons for targeting specific kinds of errors for correction?

4. Feedback techniques. How did we correct?

- Did we say what was wrong. Transcribe one example.

- Did we say what was wrong and provide a model for the right form
  Transcribe one example.

- Did we say what was wrong, provide a model for the right form and have the student repeat. Transcribe one example.

- Did we say what was wrong and ask the student to produce the right form
  Transcribe one example.

- Did we say what was wrong and provide a grammatical explanation
  Transcribe one example.

- Did we say what was wrong, provide a grammatical explanation and elicit the right answer. Transcribe one example.

- Did not say what was wrong but did we ask for clarification to elicit the right answer. For ex: what did you say about the dog? I did not understand what you said about the dog? Transcribe one example.

- Did not say what was wrong, but did we ask for clarification and then reformulate the student wrong answer. For ex.: Learner: Elle est étudiant. Teacher: Elle est étudiante. Transcribe one example.

- Did not say what was wrong, but did ask for clarification, reformulate and ask the student to repeat the right form. Transcribe one example.

- Other. Transcribe examples.

5. Language: did we correct more frequently in French or in English or in a mixture of both languages? Transcribe one example for each case. Might there only be one case here?

6. Did we give students advice on how to improve?

---

[i] The transcription conventions used in the quote are the following:

T	identifies teacher
Su	pseudonym to replace student's name
Erreur	error made in French
Erreur	corrected error
English	utterance in the first language (English in our case)
X	unclear utterance
-	speaker self-interrupts